

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

EMIL WASHINGTON,	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	No. 1:24-cv-1262
v.	)	
	)	Honorable Paul L. Maloney
PFIZER & CO., INC., <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
Defendants.	)	
_____	)	

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

This matter comes before the court on Plaintiff Emil Washington’s objection. (ECF No. 8). Judge Berens issued a report and recommendation, which would dismiss this action. (ECF No. 6) The court will adopt the report and recommendation over Plaintiff’s objection.

**I.**

Plaintiff filed his *pro se* complaint in this case on November 26, 2024, against Pfizer & Co., Inc., DK Security Company, Next 150 Company, Timothy Williams, and Mia Scruggs. Plaintiff alleges that Defendants violated Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (“Title VII”), 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000e *et seq.*, and the Michigan Elliott-Larsen Civil Rights Act (“ELCRA”), and engaged in stalking conduct prohibited by Mich. Comp. Laws 750.411h. (ECF No. 1 at PageID.1-4). After conducting an initial review of the complaint, Judge Berens recommended that Plaintiff’s Title VII claim and all his claims against DK Security Company and Next 150 Company be dismissed for failure to state a claim and that the Court decline to exercise supplemental jurisdiction over the state-law claims and dismiss them without

prejudice. Before filing his objections, but after the report and recommendation issued, Plaintiff also filed an amended complaint. (ECF No. 7).

## II.

After being served with a report and recommendation issued by a magistrate judge, a party has fourteen days to file written objections to the proposed findings and recommendations. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2). A district court judge reviews de novo the portions of the R&R to which objections have been filed. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). Only those objections that are specific are entitled to a de novo review under the statute. *Mira v. Marshall*, 806 F.2d 636, 637 (6th Cir. 1986) (per curiam). An “objection does not oblige the district court to ignore the report and recommendation.” *Pharmacy Recs. v. Nassar*, 465 F. App’x 448, 456 (6th Cir. 2012). Our Local Rules require any party objecting to a report and recommendation to “specifically identify the portions of the proposed findings, recommendations or report to which objections are made and the basis for such objections.” W.D. Mich. LCivR 72.3(b); *see also Miller v. Currie*, 50 F.3d 373, 380 (6th Cir. 1995) (holding that “objections disput[ing] the correctness of the magistrate’s recommendation but fail[ing] to specify the findings . . . believed [to be] in error” are too general).

## III.

Plaintiff raised three objections to the report and recommendation. (ECF No. 8). Plaintiff attempts to elaborate on his pleading’s deficiencies. But none of his objections cite erroneous application of the law or factual inaccuracies in the report and recommendation. In this court’s judgment, Plaintiff’s objections are too general and are not proper objections.

*Pharmacy Recs.*, 465 F. App'x at 456; *Miller*, 50 F.3d at 380. Accordingly, Plaintiff's objections are rejected.

The court has reviewed Plaintiff's first amended complaint. (ECF No. 7). It does not cure any of the defects outlined in the report and recommendation. Therefore, the court will reject the filing because accepting it would be futile. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 15; *Rose v. Hartford Underwriters Ins. Co.*, 203 F.3d 417, 420 (6th Cir. 2000).

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that the report and recommendation (ECF No. 6) is **ADOPTED** by the court. The court dismisses Defendants DK Security Company and Next 150 Company from the action with prejudice, dismisses Plaintiff's Title VII claim with prejudice, and dismisses the state law claims without prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367(c)(3).

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's objection to the report and recommendation (ECF No. 8) is **DENIED**.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that Plaintiff's first amended complaint (ECF No. 7) is **REJECTED** as futile.

Judgment to follow.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Date: May 21, 2025

/s/ Paul L. Maloney  
Paul L. Maloney  
United States District Judge